

## REPORT OF THE TWENTIETH MEETING

### Purpose:

This document presents the Report of the Consortium Board's Twentieth Meeting held on 11 May 2015.

- **Agenda items.** The meeting comprised the 9 agenda items set out in the table of contents on the following page.
- **Decisions.** This report presents the official record of the meeting including the 10 decisions adopted by the Board, as set out in full text in Annex 1.
- **Participants.** The participant list is set out at Annex 2.

This report was approved by the Consortium Board at its Twenty-Second Meeting, 1 – 2 November 2015 (CB/B22/DP02)

## Contents

Agenda Item 1 - Opening remarks, agenda, consent agenda items.....	2
Agenda item 2 - High-level recap from 13 <sup>th</sup> Fund Council meeting (April 2015, Bogor) .....	3
Agenda item 3 – Options Team recommendations (FC13 Detailed session 1) .....	3
Agenda item 4 - Report of the Audit and Risk Management Committee (ARC) .....	5
Agenda item 5 – Revised Investment Policy Guidelines.....	6
Agenda item 6 – SRF, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Call Guidance for Pre-Proposals, Dryland Systems and Genebanks (FC13 Detailed session 2).....	6
Agenda item 7 - Nominations and Evaluations Committee .....	9
Agenda item 8: Resource mobilization .....	12
Agenda item 9: Meeting summary and other business.....	13
Annex 1.....	15
Annex 2.....	17

## Agenda Item 1 - Opening remarks, agenda, consent agenda items

1. Lynn Haight (Chair) welcomed board colleagues, participants and observers, beginning the meeting by inviting comments or additions to the provisional Agenda issued on 3 May 2015, noting that a request had been made for the independent members to meet together for an in-camera session whilst in Windsor. It was proposed that this meeting, to discuss outcomes of the Fund Council's deliberations on the Final Options Team Report, be held after the close of other Board deliberations;
2. **Decision:** The Board approves the Agenda **(CB/B20/DP01)**.
3. Paul Zuckerman, Chair of the Governance and Policy Coordination Committee (GPCC) tabled the Board Chair sponsored proposal to introduce a consent agenda concept into the Consortium Board's Rules of Procedure. Board members were comfortable with this change provided that there was sufficient advance notice of consent agenda items before the meeting.
4. **Decision:** The Board approves the revised Consortium Board Rules of Procedure as set out in document number CB20-02 **(CB/B20/DP02)**.
5. **Decision:** The Board approves the Twentieth Board Meeting Consent Agenda, as follows:
  - a. The Board approves the Report of the Nineteenth meeting as set out in document number CB20-03. **(CB/B20/DP03)**

- b. The Board notes the status of ongoing Board actions, and responsibilities for taking these forward, as set out in document number CB20-04.
6. Martin Kropff, external independent Board member, disclosed that with effect from 1 June 2015, he would take up the role of Director General of CIMMYT, a CGIAR member center, rendering him ineligible to serve thereafter as a Consortium Board member.<sup>1</sup>

**Agenda item 2 - High-level recap from 13<sup>th</sup> Fund Council meeting (April 2015, Bogor)**

**Agenda item 3 – Options Team recommendations (FC13 Detailed session 1)**

7. The Board Chair confirmed that the Options Team final report of 8 April 2015 had been a considerable focus of the Fund Council's deliberations. This had meant that topics such as essential resource mobilization efforts for 2016 and beyond were given less agenda time than would otherwise have been expected. For this reason, it was proposed that items 2 and 3 of the agenda would be dealt with at the same time.
8. Reconfirming that the Options Team decisions would be discussed in-camera between the Independent Members, the Board Chair proposed that those later conversations would be aided by high level reflections from other participants at the meeting. The meeting had at its disposition a copy of the final decisions from Bogor (extracted as Consortium Board document CB20-09).
9. Tony Simons, Centers DG representative on the Consortium Board, reflected that donors gave the impression of having more faith and confidence in CGIAR as a system, but still not enough trust, as reflected by the decisions finally taken. He interpreted the decision as the donors wanting to take charge, reflecting also that the introduction of non-voting regional representatives may have been a way to introduce some level of distance/objectivity in deliberations than just all donors, although clearly not independence in the same sense as afforded by the membership status of Consortium Board colleagues. With much more to understand before the full implications of the decision set in, he also noted that it would be necessary to absorb the transition pain and move forward with the input and support of many, and ideally with much more senior representation on the new System Council than currently on the Fund Council. He also observed that perhaps an elegant way to summarize how he saw the decision was that Centers had lost power in the system, but ideally had increased their sphere of influence through direct engagement with the donors, although not on an equal footing.
10. Ann Tutwiler reminded the Board of the deliberations at its Mexico March 2015 meeting, and the sentiment that a decision, even a bad one, was better than no decision, and that she stood by the sentiment as a means to take away the ongoing uncertainty that had been prevailing for many months. That said, she observed that she had hoped that the new system would result in significantly more interaction

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Article 7(6) of the Consortium Board Constitution.

between Centers and the funders, but could not see this in the decisions with only still two non-voting entry points.

11. Daniel van Gilst, representative of the Fund Council membership, and delegate of Carmen Thönnissen at the Twentieth Board, thanked the Consortium for the invitation to the meeting, and the opportunity to provide some reflections on the Bogor deliberations specifically.
12. He reflected that as with all negotiations, there are many factors to take into account, and it is rarely possible to have an ideal outcome for all. Noting that the Fund Council agreed to the one-board principle of 20 voting members quickly, buy-in from Centers was nevertheless considered as an essential element of the new System Council. Thus, the concept of active observers was introduced as a protection if the issue raised by three Fund Council members (not sitting on a board that also has funding recipients as members) could not be ultimately be resolved.
13. Before turning to other colleagues, the Board Chair shared an update that two of the three constituencies (Canada and Sweden) appeared to have been able to resolve the query, with one still to find an acceptable solution. Mr. van Gilst noted he expected the issue to be fixed.
14. Jonathan Wadsworth, Executive Secretary to the Fund Council, and Head of the Fund Office, reflected on the significant work that went before the Bogor deliberations even before the almost 12 hours of discussions at the meeting itself. He emphasized the evolutionary nature of the Fund Council's consideration of the issues, before it took a pragmatic consensus-based decision based on plenary contributions.
15. The Board Chair invited the Fund Council representative and/or Executive Secretary to comment on whether the issue of having external independent members was adequately discussed from their perspective. Respectively, they observed that:
  - a. Whilst contained as an element within a number of the individual option proposals, the principle of the system council having independent members was not incorporated in the final decision to keep the system council down to a manageable level, taking into account other membership requirements; and
  - b. There was considerable discussion about the importance of an independent Chair, with the World Bank ultimately being invited to put forward a candidate, which is something that the Bank will need to consider. On independent members more generally, and noting the Options Team report raised some interesting points, there was perhaps scope to have had more discussion on the topic as a personal observation.
16. The independent members of the Board expressed dismay at the final decision of the Fund Council, noting that it had been taken without apparent regard to multiple representations on the clear merits of independent persons on Boards with fiduciary responsibilities, namely to make systems work because they do not come to the table

with a clear interest. One member observed that the Fund Council decision was irreconcilable with the dramatic changes in the corporate world to improve system-wide governance, and that ultimately, the decision as taken represented a tremendous missed opportunity to lead by example in the development world. Another member questioned whether it was intentional that the Fund Council undermined one of the fundamental principles of the 2009 CGIAR Reform - to take out direct influence of donors on individual Centers.

17. The Fund Council representative acknowledged the strength of the principle of why sufficient independence matters, suggesting that there may be scope to shape the process further during the transition phase based on a Consortium Board further submission. While noting that a proposal to increase the size of the voting members would be hard to accept, there remained quite a lot of flexibility to put forward other suggestions because so much remained undecided.
18. Chandra Madramootoo, Centers Board of Trustees representative suggested that if the Consortium Board as a whole felt minded to put forward a proposal for inclusion as the transition evolved, it would be important to focus on the essential points, and not seek to open up all the parameters again. He added that it would be clearer if the Centers and Consortium Board came together and had a much stronger story on such issues.
19. The Center and Fund Council representatives, and Fund Office Head each noted the importance of the Consortium Board continuing to serve during the transition phase, to retain consistent leadership for the year ahead.
20. The Board Chair summarized the deliberations as resulting in a variety of views being on the table for consideration, with the independent members taking the topic up again during its in-camera session.

#### **Agenda item 4 - Report of the Audit and Risk Management Committee (ARC)**

21. The Consortium's Director of Finance and Corporate Services provided a brief introduction, referring back to the preliminary discussions in Mexico's March 2015 Consortium Board meeting when the anticipated deficit for 2014 was projected at approximately US\$ 563,000. Ultimately, this was settled at approximately US\$ 293,000, arising due to the longer than expected Bioversity hosting arrangements, and the difference being muted mainly by shared services income.
22. The FCSD noted the unqualified audit opinion, and confirmed that management was in agreement with the request of the external auditors made during the ARC meeting for disclosure to be made in regard to the forthcoming governance changes, in a new note "19".
23. The ARC Chair confirmed that the committee recommended the 2014 audited financial statements for approval, with inclusion of the new note 19 to be added after agreement between the external auditors and management on the form of that

statement. He further confirmed that the ARC had met with the external auditor in camera, as required under Part II (i) of the ARC Charter, with no issues arising.

24. **Decision:** The Board approves the CGIAR Consortium Audited Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2014, with a disclosure of governance changes statement as agreed between the external auditors and management, as set out in Annex 2 to document number CB20-05, Revision 1 **(CB/B20/DP04)**.

#### **Agenda item 5 – Revised Investment Policy Guidelines**

25. The GPCC Chair reported that whilst the committee had considered the material in advance of the meeting, he believed a key issue remained that he had only identified as he prepared to speak to the proposed Revised Investment Policy Guidelines (CB20-08) during the meeting. On that basis, the Board deferred its discussion, with the Board Chair proposing that it be dealt with electronically after the matter had been discussed and resolved satisfactorily.

#### **Agenda item 6 – SRF, 2<sup>nd</sup> Call Guidance for Pre-Proposals, Dryland Systems and Genebanks (FC13 Detailed session 2)**

26. 2016 – 2030 Strategy and Results Framework (SRF). The Consortium CEO provided an update on deliberations from the Fund Council's 13<sup>th</sup> Meeting in Bogor on the 15 April 2015 version as cleared by the SPPC under delegated authority of the Consortium Board. He shared the Fund Council's decision that the SRF would be sent to the Funders Forum for approval, subject to the making of three key amendments, and one caveat as follows:
- a. Have more balance in the number of targets under each key goal;
  - b. Have mid-term targets at 6 years, and not only out to 2030, to be more in-line with the concept of multi-year funding on a three yearly basis;
  - c. Include text to indicate that the ISPC will develop a qualitative prioritization framework by September 2015, and will consult during the process with concerned Fund Council members to ensure that it meets their needs and concerns; and
  - d. Targets on the sub-IDOs will be set before the decisions on the 2<sup>nd</sup> call.
27. The Consortium CEO confirmed that the 7 May 2015 draft SRF before the Board brought changes a – c into effect, amongst other identified adjustments. In particular, he highlighted that the number of targets had reduced from current < 2.0 % to 2.5% by 2030; and introduced 2022 mid-term targets based on the projections to 2030 but recognizing that adoption rates are non-linear.
28. In confirming the SPPC's support for the revised version, the SPPC Chair noted the concern that the productivity increase to 2.5% could be viewed as quite aspirational, and by some as almost unrealistic. However, she noted that the relevant Centers had been involved in development of it, and a footnote had been added to the SRF to say this

advance could come from both genetic improvement and a reduction of food waste, involving the reduction of pre- and post-harvest losses. The SPPC Chair also noted that as the time lag between a research result and the development is always quite long – and on average 15 years – a result in 7 years is also not typical. However, she accepted that it was important to the funders to have some mid-term progress, and noted that previous research could contribute to the results.

29. The Consortium CEO shared the Fund Council's agreement that with the adjustments now made after the Bogor, April 2015 meeting (as also discussed with the ISPC where relevant), the SRF could be used as the basis for the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for pre-proposals, with Funders Forum submission following thereafter. That step would occur immediately following Consortium Board endorsement of the revised material.
30. Responding to other questions:
  - a. The Consortium CEO confirmed that the question on gender raised earlier by a representative of the Gates Foundation was not fully addressed in this version of the SRF, but there was acknowledgement it would be taken up in due course; and
  - b. The SPPC Chair confirmed that although IFPRI had not been able to undertake more specific quantification work (with an earlier conversation on funding from IFAD not eventuating into final support), the work coordinated by Bas Bouman meant that there was confidence in the targets presented, as they had come out of initial IFPRI modeling and also from research findings within the existing portfolio.
31. **Decision:** The Board endorses, for submission and endorsement by the Fund Council and final approval of the Funders' Forum, the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016 – 2030 as set out in Annex 1 to document number CB20-12, Revision 1 (**CB/B20/DP05**).
32. **2<sup>nd</sup> call pre-proposal Guidance:** The Consortium CEO shared that there had been extensive discussions in Bogor in April 2015, with ongoing alignment on the overall strategy and timetable. The next key event following the Centers' meeting over 12 – 14 May (immediately following the Board) was a proposed virtual meeting on 21 May 2015 involving Fund Council members, the Fund Office, the ISPC and the Consortium also invited to participate. The Consortium will use that meeting to take input on how to finalize the 2<sup>nd</sup> call pre-proposal guidance if by the end of the current week, the Centers have defined the portfolio in a way that can be taken forward. Thereafter, ISPC will formally comment on the proposal, before Consortium Board final approval virtually in time for the 15 June 2015 launch.
33. The Consortium CEO added that he was confident that the Centers will be able to meet the timeline of defining the portfolio, as an overall change in the 2<sup>nd</sup> call timetable was almost impossible. He also noted that the approach would move from the current portfolio of 5 years for the initial period, to 3 + 3 years, to fit in with early endorsement from the Fund Council to move to a multi-year funding cycle, although not yet approval of replenishment style funding commitments.

34. Whilst supporting the ongoing work to finalize the call materials, the ARC Chair noted the inconsistency about the trust and governance principles arising from the transition process coming in the middle of this work. Namely, that the same body that must make a decision on what to recommend to the Fund Council as strong pre-proposals is not the same body that has that decision over the lifespan of the proposals, and that is not good governance.
35. Drylands Systems: The Consortium's Chief Science Officer, Wayne Powell summarized the Fund Council's discussions, confirming that the sequencing of 4 complementary presentations (from the ISPC, the Consortium, Chair of the CRP on Dryland Systems Taskforce, and the Dryland Systems Program Director) was highly appreciated by Fund Council members.
36. On some of the key discussion points, he shared that:
- a. There were ongoing reservations about the investment, with the need to identify specific hypotheses, and what is working or not working where and why.
  - b. Some had raised the question of whether the work was too far towards development, and not original research; and
  - c. Whilst the value of drylands research was accepted by many, there was a reluctance to be pre-defining how this might look as the 2<sup>nd</sup> call process was about to get underway, with funding decisions being based on performance and not only relevance.
37. On the latter point, a Center representative who also attended the Fund Council meeting confirmed the sense that if ongoing funding is to be requested, the argument for that support would need to be compelling. The Fund Council Representative shared this view, adding that it was important that people were open to considering a next generation CRP in the area – with no need to be fixated on the “dryland systems” name. He added that a statement that the Fund Council may not approve a CRP that looks like the current program for a further 6 years, does not mean that the Fund Council will not approve important research in the area.
38. The Chief Science Officer noted that there were a number of existing mechanisms that can provide sound data on which to address key challenges. These included findings from annual reporting cycles, financial programming in the annual Program of Work and Budget, and external and internal audit reviews. However, he questioned whether an external evaluation on impact would be another useful tool as there may not be sufficient years of a track record of performance to underpin findings. He also added that particularly in the Consortium's report to the Fund Council, there were some very interesting forward looking options, and it would be important for the CRP leader, and the oversight mechanisms to reflect on ways to innovate and strengthen the research.
39. The SPPC Chair noted that paradoxically, the CRP could be one of the most important if one looks at the geopolitics situation, and it may be a global failure if there is no successful dryland systems research program in the next generation CRPs. She observed that what seemed essential was a systemic approach with climate and resilience targets



and modifications to take into account the clearly helpful work that the Consortium Science Team had done in assessing possible options.

40. **Action point:** Consortium Board to reach out to the ICARDA Board Chair to share the importance of very close monitoring and ICARDA Board interventions as required.
41. Genebanks: The Chief Science Officer introduced the session by re-confirming the Fund Council's purpose in discussing Genebanks at its April 2015 meeting, namely recognizing the importance of safeguarding and managing CGIAR's Genebanks, the Fund Council had requested an update on planning for the continuation of the Genebanks CRP following its completion at the end of 2016.
42. Noting that there had also been a sequence of presentations and key deliberations, the Chief Science Officer confirmed that the Fund Council agreed to commit \$93.1 million for the period 2017 - 2021, per recommendation 1 of the Peer Review Team Report presented at the meeting, which in effect brings together options 1 and 2 from the report discussed by the Consortium Board at its March 2015 Mexico meeting.
43. He also confirmed that the Global Crop Diversity Trust had been asked to confirm the confidence that they have in being able to build the endowment to meet this commitment, with a detailed costing to be presented at the Fund Council's 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. He also added that these outcomes followed an early possible discussion of perhaps having a fee to access the Genebanks material, but this was not ultimately supported. Rather, it was agreed that if insufficient funding did not eventuate through the endowment, then the Fund Council will apply an across the board levy to ease the burden from a historical perspective of really only a very small number of donors supporting such a key part of the CGIAR's assets.
44. The Fund Council representative confirmed that the Bogor decisions had included a discussion on the suitability of a "tax" by CRP's or increasing the existing levy from 2% to 3%, with access to window 1 funding being a fallback.
45. The Board Chair observed that it would be important to ensure that the Genebanks program receives a lot of attention over the period to end 2016, so that there is no question of its ongoing adequate support.
46. Noting comments from the floor of the possible gaps in the current Genebanks program, including links with the animal side, and microbes, a Center representative confirmed that the 11 of the Center Director Generals will meet over the coming days to discuss genetic resources and whether, and how to deal with animals and fish.

#### **Agenda item 7 - Nominations and Evaluations Committee**

47. The Chair of the Nominations and Evaluations Committee (NEC), reported on deliberations of the committee in advance of the Board meeting under 5 headings, confirming that although Chandra Madramootoo had just left the Board meeting, he was in full support of all 5 points as a voting member of the NEC.

48. Replacement for Martin Kropff: Noting the imminent retirement of Martin Kropff as Board member, the Committee returned to its external consultants to identify a possible replacement, and then met by virtual means to discuss a possible short list of candidates. Whilst originally intending to bring to the Board two strong candidates, after further deliberations, the NEC is putting forward one name, by reason that the other potential candidate brought to the role the risk that their other experiences would result in a potential conflicts of interest, notwithstanding their clear experience and overall suitability for the role. The person proposed to join the Board was Professor Molly Jahn, subject to the support of the Centers. The NEC Chair provided a summary of Professor Jahn's experience and a CV was made available to members who were not familiar with her name electronically during the session.
49. Exceptional extension of the terms of Ganesan Balachander and Lynn Haight beyond 31 December 2015: The NEC Chair confirmed that in the circumstances of the transition, it seemed prudent to continue with experienced persons on the Board and until the transition hand over, and not allow vacancies to arise due to the expiration of normal term limits. The NEC Chair confirmed that having been asked of their willingness to serve in advance of the Board meeting, both had confirmed their willingness to serve on an ongoing basis.
50. Renewal of the Term of Marion Guillou from 1 January 2016: Presented by Paul Zuckerman, NEC member, it was recommended that the Board agree to renew Marion Guillou's term as member of the Consortium Board with effect from 1 January 2016, subject to Center approval. Further, it was proposed by Paul Zuckerman, that Marion Guillou continue to serve as SPPC Chair until the end of the transition period, noting that her appointment in March 2015 had been agreed as interim measure through until mid-2015. Mariou Guillou accepted this nomination.
51. Appointment of Lynn Haight as Board Chair with effect from the date of Center approval: Taking back the presenter's role, the NEC Chair noted the NEC's recommendation that Lynn Haight, serving as Interim Board Chair from 1 January 2015, be appointed as Board Chair on a continuing basis until the end of the transition handover. Lynn Haight left the room at this point to enable the Board to hold its deliberations absent her involvement. Board members confirmed their support for this role, noting the strong relationships that Lynn had with Fund Council members, and that there was the sense that Lynn had increased the level of trust between the Centers and the Consortium.
52. Lynn Haight returned to the meeting room. She was informed that the Board supported her term extension, including taking on the Board Chair role officially until the end of the transition. Lynn Haight confirmed her acceptance of the continuing role of Board Chair and stated it was her intent to serve to the best of her ability, and her deep commitment to make the system stronger during her period of service.

53. **Decision:** The Board approves, subject to CGIAR Member Center approval:
- a. With effect from 1 June 2015, the appointment of Molly Jahn as an external independent Board member until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of the operations of the Board **(CB/B20/DP06)**;
  - b. With effect from 1 January 2016 and until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board:
    - i. The exceptional extension of Lynn Haight and Ganesan Balachander as external independent members **(CB/B20/DP07)**; and
    - ii. The renewal of Marion Guillou as an external independent Board member. **(CB/B20/DP08)**
54. **Decision:** The Board:
- a. Approves the appointment of Lynn Haight as Board Chair until the date of the transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board **(CB/B20/DP09)**; and
  - b. Reconfirms the appointment of Marion Guillou as SPPC Chair on a continuing basis until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board **(CB/B20/DP10)**.
55. Assisted evaluation of Consortium Board performance: The NEC Chair reported that it had originally been intended that each two years there would be an externally assisted evaluation of Board performance, and on the other year, an internal only evaluation. Whilst in 2015 it was scheduled to be the externally assisted evaluation, the Board's deliberations in Mexico in March 2015 had resulted in an agreement that it would be for the NEC to undertake this evaluation internally. Based on the Bogor decisions, the NEC Chair confirmed the updated position of the NEC that they did not recommend an evaluation of Board performance now occur in any format.
56. **Decision:** Noting the Board's decision at its Sixth Meeting to hold an evaluation each year, and taking into consideration the decisions of the Fund Council in April 2015 to transform the governance arrangements of the CGIAR system as a whole, the Board decided against carrying out the 2015 Board member self-evaluation **(CB/B20/DP11)**.
57. The NEC Chair closed the session with the observation that unless another NEC matter arose, it was likely that the May 2015 meeting of the NEC was its final formal meeting.
58. The Fund Office Head rejoined the Board meeting as an observer, confirming he had heard the outcome of the discussions under this agenda item, and welcomed the decision on continuity.

## Agenda item 8: Resource mobilization

59. The Board Chair opened the discussion by emphasizing that the Board, Fund Council and Centers are not performing their roles if insufficient attention is paid to ensuring that there are resources in the system to fund the existing CRPs and then deliver on the new SRF. She reported that positively, the Fund Office with the Consortium Office was now intending to meet in Cape Town in June to develop a plan, and that the Fund Council had requested a resource mobilization strategy to be presented in November this year. For now, she summarized that the paper before the Consortium Board offered the opportunity to put in up to US\$ 500,000 towards resource mobilization efforts, arising out of efficiencies identified by the Consortium Office in March 2015.
60. Responding to the question from one Board member of whether now was the right time to make this decision, one of the Center's DG representatives agreed that there was considerable uncertainty – with knowledge already that the World Bank contribution in 2016 will be less than 2015, and concerns it and other contributions will be lower thereafter. He emphasized that unless there was a conscious effort to put money into the system on a system-wide basis, there was an inevitable return to CRPs needing to be funded by bilateral approaches at Center level.
61. In discussions that continued, the Consortium CEO agreed with the statement from a Board colleague that focusing on high-net worth individuals as a new area was not now the right strategy. Rather, the paper was proposing that the focus return to core efforts to highlight the strengths of CGIAR, including engagements focused on supporting governments to take strong messages to their capitals to maintain, and/or grow their support. The other Center DG's representative stressed maintenance efforts were particularly important based on informal discussions she had already been having with donors in advance of 2016 commitments, with ongoing communication and engagement being critical.
62. The Consortium CEO agreed with the Board Chair's assessment that an investment of effort could act as a pivot for other efforts, and confirmed that the Consortium Office was working to support the Fund Office's presentation of a strong resource mobilization strategy at the Fund Council November 2015 meeting.
63. The Consortium Office's Director of Strategic Partnerships provided additional detail on those actions under the Board paper (CB-06) that are still proposed to be continued, including developing the website into a more donor/partner friendly interactive tool; strategic outreach opportunities; building the capacity to follow up on leads through a Customer Relationship Management tool that has been offered to CGIAR at discounted development-entity rates, and support for the Green Climate Fund application and other like initiatives.
64. The Board Chair noted the importance of the Consortium Office leading outreach and events, and then working closely with the Fund Office and trustee as they worked to present a compelling Resource Mobilization strategy to the Fund Council in November 2015. The Consortium CEO confirmed this approach, saying that it was clear that there

was no benefit now to the Consortium recruiting additional staff to lead Resource Mobilization, but that all efforts were being put into supporting the Fund Office's development of the strategy.

65. The Fund Office representative confirmed that, "from last week" instructions had been given to his team to work with the Consortium Office as one resource mobilization effort. In this regard, he agreed that presenting CGIAR externally was a Consortium/Center effort, because this is where the details are known. He confirmed that although the timing of the Fund Council's consideration of the Resource Mobilization strategy in November 2015 was quite late, he would be pushing it as a joint CO/FO effort.
66. A Center DG representative also emphasized that the Center position also needs to be one that people stop talking about "our own Center" and start talking as a system wide approach to ensuring sufficient predictable funding from the donor group to deliver on the SRF. The other Center DG emphasized the need to stay focused on doing what was necessary right up to the hand over point of the Consortium Board, rather than drop the effort.
67. One Board member noted the significant disappointment that the Transition plan decision from Bogor was proposing the World Bank be the Chair, at the same time as the World Bank was known to be reducing its direct contribution to CGIAR for future years. Another commented that such decisions provided an incentive at Center level to look outside window 1 and 2 funds, and that the proposal before the Board for consideration did not therefore feel appropriate in the current context. He added, that in any event, the paper before the Board would need adjusting before it could be supported, now that the scope was once again different to what had been earlier thought as appropriate to take forward.
68. The Board Chair suggested this was a good place to draw the conclusion that the Consortium Office would need to review the paper, and adjust the associated budget, to take out areas now not a priority, and bring it back to the Board for support electronically.
69. **Action point:** The Consortium Office's Resource Mobilization plan for 2015 be amended and brought back to the Board to focus on outreach and communicating the value of the CGIAR brand, in support of broader resource mobilization efforts.

#### **Agenda item 9: Meeting summary and other business**

70. All present joined the Board Chair in expressing their deep appreciation to Martin Kropff for his dedicated service to the Consortium Board over the past 2.5 years, and particularly his efforts to lead the development of the new SRF. The Board wished Martin well in his new role as CIMMYT Director General, and expressed its gratitude that Martin's skills were not being lost to the CGIAR system.
71. Martin thanked the Board for its support and looked forward to working closely with the Consortium Board and Consortium Office from his new vantage point.

72. Thereafter, the external independent members met for an in camera session. The records of that discussion remain confidential under paragraph 14.4 of the Consortium Board's Rules of Procedure.

## Decisions of the Consortium Board's Twentieth Meeting

### Purpose

*This annex sets out the full text of decisions taken by the Consortium Board at its Twentieth meeting.*

#### **CB/B20/DP01: Approval of the Agenda (Agenda Item 1)**

The Board approves the Agenda.

#### **CB/B20/DP02: Approval of revised CB rules of procedure (Agenda Item 1)**

The Board approves the revised Consortium Board Rules of Procedure as set out in document number CB20-02.

#### **CB/B20/DP03: Approval of consent agenda items (Agenda Item 1)**

The Board approves the Report of the Nineteenth meeting as set out in document number CB20-03.

#### **CB/B20/DP04: Approval of audited 2014 Financial Statements (Agenda Item 4)**

The Board approves the CGIAR Consortium Audited Financial Statements for the year ended 31 December 2014, with the inclusion of a disclosure of governance changes statement as agreed between the external auditors and management, as set out in Annex 2 to document number CB20-05, Revision 1.

#### **CB/B20/DP05: Approval of amended 2016 - 2030 SRF (Agenda Item 6)**

The Board endorses, for submission and endorsement by the Fund Council and final approval of the Funders' Forum, the CGIAR Strategy and Results Framework 2016 – 2030 as set out in Annex 1 to document number CB20-12, Revision 1.

#### **CB/B20/DP06: Appointment of Professor Molly Jahn as a Consortium Board Member (Agenda Item 7)**

The Board approves, subject to CGIAR Member Center approval, with effect from 1 June 2015, the appointment of Molly Jahn as an external independent Board member until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of the operations of the Board.

**CB/B20/DP07: Exceptional Extension of Board Member Terms** *(Agenda Item 7)*

The Board approves, subject to CGIAR Member Center approval, with effect from 1 January 2016 and until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board, the exceptional extension of Lynn Haight and Ganesan Balachander as external independent member.

**CB/B20/DP08: Renewal of Board Member Term** *(Agenda Item 7)*

The Board approves, subject to CGIAR Member Center approval, with effect from 1 January 2016 and until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board, the renewal of Marion Guillou as an external independent Board member.

**CB/B20/DP09: Appointment of Lynn Haight as Board Chair** *(Agenda Item 7)*

The Board approves the appointment of Lynn Haight as Board Chair until the date of the transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board.

**CB/B20/DP10: Reconfirmation of the appointment of SPPC Chair** *(Agenda Item 7)*

The Board reconfirms the appointment of Marion Guillou as SPPC Chair on a continuing basis until the date of transition to the CGIAR System Council and the end of operations of the Board.

**CB/B20/DP11: Board member evaluation** *(Agenda Item 7)*

Noting the Board's decision at its Sixth Meeting to hold an evaluation each year, and taking into consideration the decisions of the Fund Council in April 2015 to transform the governance arrangements of the CGIAR system as a whole, the Board decided against carrying out the 2015 Board member self-evaluation.



## CB20 Participants List

Attendee	Role
Lynn Haight	Board Chair
Marion Guillou	Board Member
Martin Kropff	Board Member
Klaus Leisinger	Board Member
Agnes Mwang'ombe (present for items 1-6)	Board Member
Paul Zuckerman	Board Member
Frank Rijsberman	Ex-Officio Board Member
Bas Bouman	CRP Representative
Chandra Madramootoo (present for items 1-6)	Centers' Board Chair Representative
Tony Simons	Centers' DG Representative
Ann Tutwiler	Centers' DG Representative
Daniel Van Gilst	Observer, Fund Council
Jonathan Wadsworth (present for items 1-6 and 8-9)	Observer, Fund Office
Karmen Bennett	Senior Advisor, Governance/Board Secretary CGIAR Consortium
Nthisana Philipps	Director of Finance and Corporate Services, CGIAR Consortium
Wayne Powell	Chief Science Officer, CGIAR Consortium
Alain Vidal	Director of Strategic Partnerships

Apologies	Role
Ganesan Balachander	Board Member